UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,824	07/25/2003	Genady Grabarnik	YOR920030326US1	3765

7590 01/19/2007

Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560

EXAMINER
SEYE, ABDOU K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/627,824	GRABARNIK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Abdou Karim Seye	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *03* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07/25/2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *23* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *08/28* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

THOMSON
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/10/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is the initial office action based on the application filed on July 25, 2003.

Claims 1-23 are currently pending and have been considered below.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 23 is objected to because it includes the element " a machine readable medium" which is not enclosed within specification.

Applicant is suggested to amend the claim to recite the language within the specification (page 16) as the computer program is stored in a physical device and as to avoid confusion with other type of non-physical devices (i.e. signal or carrier wave).

A correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-9, 13-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chu et al. **(US 6427146).**

Claims 1, 17 and 23: Chu discloses a system and method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine, comprising the steps of:

a.Obtaining message data representing past messages (col. 4 event data from database in fig. 3/22, lines 6-8); and

b. Generating one or more message parsing rules by a process based on the obtained message data, and at least one of one or more existing rule templates and user selection and classification of at least a portion of a message, wherein the one or more parsing rules are storable for access by a rule-based parsing system (fig. 3/58; fig. 1, col. 3, lines 13-65).

Claim 2: Chu further discloses that the past messages are associated with one of a network, an application and a system being analyzed (col. 4, lines 30-35).

Claim 3: Chu further discloses that the message data is obtained by at least one of: (i) reading past message data from one or more messages logs; and (ii) one of the network, the application and the system pointing to message data in existing data storage (fig. 3/54,22).

Claims 4 and 18: Chu discloses a method as in claim 1 above and further

discloses the rule-based parsing system comprises a message adaptation system (fig. 2/34,24; fig. 3/14).

Claims 5 and 19: Chu discloses a method as in claim 1 above and further discloses the step of establishing a message structure prior to the generating one or more message parsing rules (fig. 2, col. 3, lines 30-45).

Claims 6 and 20: Chu further discloses that, the step of establishing a message structure comprises the steps of:

a. Creating a message skeleton (fig. 1, col. 3, lines 13-24);

b. Matching the one or more rule templates against the message skeleton (fig.1/16); and

c. Providing potential matches to a user for validation and choice of a proper message structure (fig. 1, lines 13-24).

Claim 7: Chu further discloses that the message structure is found to be insufficient, templates are built by an iterative process between the user and the machine based on user selection of at least a portion of the message (fig. 1, col. 3, lines 49-52; fig. 3/58, col. 4, lines 1-35).

Claim 9: Chu discloses a method steps as in claim 6 and further dsicloses the message skeleton comprises information relating to one or more of a message start, a message end, and a separator between fields (fig. 6, col. 7 lines 13-23);

the generated action e-mail message sent to a commander). The element "e-mail " of Chu's reference meets the claimed limitation.

Claim 13: Chu discloses a method as in claim 1 above and further discloses the one or more generated parsing rules comprises a regular expression of a portion of a message (fig. 9, col. 7, lines 25-32).

Claim 14: Chu discloses a method as in claim 1 above and further discloses that each of the one or more generated parsing rules comprises a transformation rule of a portion of a message (fig. 9, col. 7, lines 33-40).

Claim 15: Chu further discloses the transformation rule comprises a string constant (fig. 6/74).

Claim 16: Chu further discloses that the transformation rule comprises a permutation of one or more input tokens (fig. 6/74 and 76).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary

skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 8, 10-11 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Chu. **(US 6427146)** in view of Kondoh et al **(US 20020078406).**

Claims 8, 10-12 and 21- 22: Chu discloses a method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user selection of a message data and a machine (fig. 1-3), but does not explicitly disclose: a classification of positive and negative example; the machine parsing the message data sequentially until unparseable message is encountered; the machine displaying the unparseable message to the user and the user marking the selected portion as one of positive example and a negative example; and the machine learning based on the example and creating one or more candidate rules. However, In the same field of endeavor Kondoh discloses a parsing system of data string that includes predetermine parsing rules and a syntax recovery unit that contains appropriate reference type of target document as positive and negative example (paragraph 71); a parser parsing the data string sequentially until unparseable message is encountered (fig. 2, paragraph 82); a display of the unparseable message to the user and the user marking the selected portion as one of positive example and a negative example (fig. 2, paragraph 83); and a machine learning based on the example and creating one or more candidate rules (fig. 1/23 and 1/30, paragraph 64). Therefore, It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chu's invention with Kondoh's invention in order to include error correction processing unit for unparseable events data. One would have been motivated to provide an error correction unit within a parsing system in order to gain optimal output result.

Claim 12: Chu further discloses the step of the machine revising the one or more candidate rules based on feedback from the user (col. 6, lines 1-5).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

Xu et al (6493694) discloses a method and system for correcting customer service orders.

Lauterbach et al (20040250259) discloses a method and system for incremental object generation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Exr. Abdou Seye whose telephone number is (571) 270-1062. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, contact the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson at (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for formal or official faxes to Technology Center 3600 is

(571) 273-8300. Draft or informal faxes, which will not be entered in the application, may be submitted directly to the examiner at (571) 273-6722. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.

AKS
January 05,2007

William Thomson
Supervisory Patent Examiner